# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/766,673 | 01/27/2004 | Steven K. Ma | SVL920030110US1 | 3028 |

47069    7590    07/23/2008
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| HANNE, SARA M |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2179 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 07/23/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.         2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This action is responsive to the application amendment received January 5, 2008

Claims 1-30 with Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21 are pending in the application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2.      The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.      Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-15, 18-19, 21-25 and 28-29, are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moehrle, US Patent 7216301.

As in Independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, Moehrle teaches a method, system and

article of manufacture for causing operations to be performed comprising a processor

and computer readable medium including a file viewer executable by the processor to

perform operations including: rendering a display of at least one data set name (Fig. 4A,

ref. 102), wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components (Fig.

4B, 10b-10d); receiving selection of one displayed data set name (Col. 5, line 6) and

displaying names of the file components associated with the selected data set (Col. 5,

lines 8-9); receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names

(Fig. 4B, Selection of ref. 50); and rendering the selected data set name and selected at

least one selected file component name in a history panel (Fig. 4C), wherein the

selected data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a

hierarchical tree arrangement (Fig. 4B to 4C and corresponding text).

As in Claims 2, 12 and 22, Moehrle teaches the data set name is displayed as a

parent at a higher hierarchical level (Fig. 4B, 10a) to the file components (Fig. 4B, 10b-

10d) associated with the displayed data set name (Fig. 4B, 101), wherein the file

components are rendered as children in the history panel of the data set with which they

are associated ("menu item 1.0 is the parent of menu items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4", Col.

3, lines 22-23).

As in Claims 3, 13 and 23, Moehrle teaches receiving one search qualifier (Fig.

7C); transmitting a request for data set names that satisfy the received at least one

search qualifier (1.2.3.x), wherein the displayed data set names comprise data set

names returned in response to the transmitted request whose name satisfies the at

least one search qualifier (Col. 8, lines 36-39).

As in Claims 4, 14 and 24, Moehrle teaches transmitting a request for file

component names of the selected data set name, wherein the displayed file component

names comprise file component names returned in response to the transmitted request

for file component names (Col. 9, lines 16-20).

As in Claims 5, 15 and 25 Moehrle teaches the displayed at least one data set

name and at least one file component name are displayed in a search panel separate

from the history panel displaying the selected data set and/or file component names (As

seen in Fig. 5B, the history panel is displayed in the top line and a data set name, 1.2.4

and at least one file component name 1.2.4.4 are displayed in the lines below).

As in Claims 8, 18 and 28, Moehrle teaches receiving user action with respect to

one selected data set name or file component name displayed in the history panel,

wherein the action specifies an operation to perform with respect to the selected data

set name or file component (when the user selects a level it creates a tab for that level

as seen in Fig. 5D).

As in Claims 9, 19 and 29, Moehrle teaches the operation is deleting the selected

data set or file component (Fig. 5D, 5E deletes previously selected 1.2.3.4).

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.      Claims 6-7, 10, 16-17, 20, 26-27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Moehrle, US Patent 7216301, and further in view of Arkhipov

et al., US Patent Application Publication 2005/0114769, hereinafter Arkhipov.

As in Claims 6, 16 and 26, Moehrle teaches the files being accessed by a

developer (user creating the active path) and steps of and means for rendering a

display of at least one data set name, wherein each data set is associated with one or

more file components; receiving selection of one displayed data set name and

displaying names of the file components associated with the selected data set; receiving

selection of at least one of the displayed file component names; and rendering the

selected data set name and selected at least one selected file component name in a

history panel, wherein the selected data set name and selected at least one file

component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement (See Claims 1, 11 and 21

rejected supra). While Moehrle teaches selection of a data set name and

corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel, they fail

to show the file components include source code as recited in the claims. In the same

field of the invention, Arkhipov teaches a file components including source code

accessing program similar to that of Moehrle. In addition, Arkhipov further teaches

editing source code file being accessed by a developer (Pg. 1, Par 11 and Fig. 2, ref.

210, 220, 280). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Moehrle and Arkhipov before him at the time the invention was made, to

modify the selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for

hierarchical display in a history panel taught by Moehrle to include the file components

to include source code of Arkhipov, in order to obtain selection of a data set name and

corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel, the file

components include source code files being accessed by a developer. One would have

been motivated to make such a combination because an Integrated Development

Environment for user's frequently used files would have been obtained, as taught by

Arkhipov.

As in Claims 7, 17, and 27, Moehrle teaches the steps of and means for rendering a display of at least one data set name, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components; receiving selection of one displayed data set name and displaying names of the file components associated with the selected data set; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names; and rendering the selected data set name and selected at least one selected file component name in a history panel, wherein the selected data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement (See Claims 1, 11 and 21 rejected supra). While Moehrle teaches selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel, they fail to show the source code files in different programming languages as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, Arkhipov teaches a file accessing program similar to that of Moehrle. In addition, Arkhipov further teaches multilanguage documents of source code that can be accessed and edited (Pg. 3, Par. 38-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Arkhipov before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel taught by Moehrle to include the multilanguage documents of source code that can be accessed and edited of Arkhipov, in order to obtain selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel the corresponding file components comprising source code documents of different languages. One would have been motivated to make such a combination

because a unified interface for source code editing would have been obtained, as taught
by Arkhipov.

As in Claims 10, 20 and 30, Moehrle teaches displaying content of the selected
file component in a panel (Fig. 5D bottom panel) displayed with the history panel (top
line) and the steps of and means for rendering a display of at least one data set name,
wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components; receiving
selection of one displayed data set name and displaying names of the file components
associated with the selected data set; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed
file component names; and rendering the selected data set name and selected at least
one selected file component name in a history panel, wherein the selected data set
name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree
arrangement (See Claims 1, 11 and 21 rejected supra).  While Moehrle teaches
selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for hierarchical
display in a history panel, displaying content of the selected file component in a panel
displayed with the history panel and suggests and editing interface for the files (Fig. 6A)
they fail to show the editing of the displayed content as recited in the claims.  In the
same field of the invention, Arkhipov teaches a file accessing program similar to that of
Moehrle.  In addition, Arkhipov further teaches editing of the displayed content (Fig. 2,
ref. 280).  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the
teachings of Moehrle and Arkhipov before him at the time the invention was made, to
modify the selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for
hierarchical display in a history panel taught by Moehrle to include the editing of the

displayed content of Arkhipov, in order to obtain selection of a data set name and

corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel, displaying

content of the selected file component in a panel displayed with the history panel and

editing of the displayed content.  One would have been motivated to make such a

combination because a unified editing interface would have been obtained, as taught by

Arkhipov.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 1/5/08 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that Moehrle does not disclose

"displaying a data set name where a data set name is associated with file components".

The claims do not require the data set name to be equivalent to a file component; they

are merely associated with one another.  The data set name is associated with the file

hierarchy being displayed in Fig. 4.  The term "data set name" is a broad term that does

not impart functionality in and of itself.

In response to the applicant's argument that Moehrle does not disclose

"rendering the selected data set name and a selected file component name in a

hierarchical tree arrangement".  The hierarchical relationship in the history panel in Fig.

5C, and the "data set name" and "file component" arguments have been addressed

*supra*.  Moehrle teaches the same functionality of the components in the disclosed

claims given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar history panels and source code editing displays.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara M. Hanne whose telephone number is (571) 272-4135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F  7:30am-4:00pm, off on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, WEILUN LO can be reached on (571) 272-4847.  The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.  Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


smh


/Weilun  Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179